

**TMDL STORMWATER FACILITY ENHANCEMENTS IN DISTRICT 3**  
**AT0865182**  
**COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSAL**  
**FINAL SELECTION RESULTS**

The State Highway Administration has made a determination that the design-build team of AB Construction / McCormick Taylor is the most advantageous to the State, considering price and the evaluation factors as set forth in the Request for Proposals. The results of these evaluations are outlined below:

<b>DESIGN-BUILD TEAM</b>	<b>BID PRICE</b>	<b>OVERALL RATING</b>
AB Construction / McCormick Taylor	\$3,568,872.57	Acceptable +
Concrete General / Whitman, Requardt & Associates	\$4,539,235.16	Good -
Corman Construction / Johnson, Mirmiran & Thompson / Century Engineering	\$5,000,000.00	Good
Environmental Quality Resources / Whitney, Bailey, Cox & Magnani	\$7,121,510.00 Non-Responsive	Not Rated

**DEFINITIONS**

***Bid Price:*** The total price of all items as listed in the Schedule of Prices. The Request for Proposals included a maximum bid price for the project of \$5,000,000.00. Proposals were considered **non-responsive**, per the Request for Proposals, if the Bid Price exceeded the maximum price.

***Overall Rating:*** The overall adjectival rating of the Design-Build Team's technical proposal.

***Adjectival Rating Definitions:*** A quality rating assigned for the overall quality rating of each proposal based on the following quality rating criteria:

***Exceptional*** – The Proposer has demonstrated an approach that is considered to significantly exceed stated objectives/requirements in beneficial way to the Administration. This rating indicates a consistently outstanding level of quality, with very little or no risk that this Proposer would fail to meet the requirements of the solicitation. There are essentially no Weaknesses as defined in the Request for Proposals.

***Good*** – The Proposer has demonstrated an approach that is considered to exceed stated objectives/requirements. This rating indicates a generally better than acceptable quality, with little risk that this Proposer would fail to meet the requirements of the solicitation. Weaknesses, if any, are very minor.

***Acceptable*** – The Proposer has demonstrated an approach that is considered to meet the stated objectives/requirements. This rating indicates an acceptable level of quality. The Proposer demonstrates a reasonable probability of success. Weaknesses are minor and can be corrected.

***Susceptible to Become Acceptable*** – The Proposer has demonstrated an approach that fails to meet stated criteria as there are weaknesses and/or deficiencies, but they are susceptible to correction through Discussions. The response is considered marginal in terms of the basic content and/or amount of information provided for evaluation, but overall the Proposer is capable of providing an acceptable or better Proposal.

***Unacceptable*** – The Proposer has demonstrated an approach that indicates significant weaknesses/deficiencies and/or unacceptable quality. The Proposal fails to meet the stated criteria and/or lacks essential information and is conflicting and/or unproductive. There is no reasonable likelihood of success. Weaknesses/deficiencies are so major and/or extensive that a major revision to the Proposal would be necessary.